

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Coeur d'Alene Field Office
3815 Schreiber Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) Worksheet

Ninemile Timber Sale Revised Decision
DOI-BLM-ID-C010-2013-0005-EA

A. Description of the Proposed Action

The BLM proposes to rescind the previous decision record (DR signed 9/17/14) for the Ninemile timber sale and make a slight modification to the description of the proposed action, specifically regarding restrictions on harvest or removal of certain tree species.

The general description of the proposed action would remain unchanged: to implement a timber sale and prescribed burn to reduce the wild land fire threat to the local community and infrastructure in the Ninemile Creek area. The BLM proposes to harvest about one million board feet of timber by thinning understory trees on 200 acres of forested public land. Following timber harvest, the BLM will prescriptively under-burn 300 acres of pine forest to reduce any hazardous fuels that threaten the old ponderosa pine trees. To facilitate harvest operations, about $\frac{3}{4}$ mile of road would be constructed. Following harvest and fuel reduction actions the BLM will install gates and implement road closures to limit motorized vehicular disturbance to wildlife.

However, the original Ninemile Timber Sale DR and the proposed action in the environmental assessment (EA) stated that all western redcedar, western white pine, dominant overstory western larch, and Engelmann spruce would be conserved. This restriction is not possible to implement and does not allow us to meet our fuels reduction goals as specified in the purpose and need in the original EA. Under the new proposed action, the BLM will still conserve these species, but will remove western red cedar, western white pine, and Engelmann spruce less than 14 inches diameter at breast height (DBH), remove western larch up to 18 inches DBH, and cut western white pine showing symptoms of blister rust, regardless of size.

All other design features and specification's in the original proposed action will be included and will remain unchanged.

The project would be implemented in two phases with a three year timber sale contract anticipated to begin in 2015 then the prescribed burning after the timber sale.

B. Location

The project area is located about 1 mile northeast of the town of Wallace, ID at: T.48 N., R.4 E. Sections 12, 13, 23, 24; and T.48 N., R.5 E unsurveyed section, Boise Meridian

C. Land Use Plan Conformance

In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), this proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with the Coeur d'Alene Resource Management Plan (RMP), approved June 2007. It is consistent with the following decisions from the RMP:

Goal WF-1- Objective WF-1.5, Action WF-1.5.3, Action WF-1.5.4, Objective WF-1.6, Action WF-1.6.3, Action WF-1.6.5

Goal VF-1-Objective VF-1.2, Action VF-1.2.1, Action VF-1.2.2, Action VF-1.2.3, Action VF-1.2.6, Objective VF-1.3

Goal FP-1-Objective FP-1.,Action FP-1.1.1

Goal FW-1-Objective FW-1.1, Action FW-1.1.,TM-1

Goal FW-2- Objective FW-2.2- Action FW-2.2.4-

Goal SS-2- Objective SS-2.5, Action SS-2.5.3, Action SS-2.5.6, Action SS-2.5.7

Goal SE-3-Objective SE-3.1

D. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Documents

The following NEPA document(s) covers the proposed action:

Ninemile Timber Sale Environmental Assessment NEPA Register Number: DOI-BLM-ID-C010-2013-0005-EA - September 17th 2014

E. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?*

Documentation of answer and explanation: The new proposed action is similar to the original proposed action analyzed in the EA. The original EA said, "Conserve all western white pine, western redcedar, dominate overstory western larch and Engelmann spruce trees located on northern aspects by thinning understory hemlock, fir and lodgepole pine trees." With this statement we cannot achieve our desired conditions to reduce hazardous fuels conditions. The BLM will retain these species on site with a upper diameter limit of 14 inches for western red cedar, western white pine and Engelmann spruce for removal. Any western white pine showing symptoms of blister rust, regardless of size, will be cut. Western Larch will have a diameter limit of 18 inches for removal.

2. *Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?*

Documentation of answer and explanation: The EA analyzed the proposed action plus one action alternative as well as the no action. This new proposed action is very similar to the original proposed action and would not warrant a new alternative to be analyzed.

3. *Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?*

Documentation of answer and explanation:

There is no new botanical or wildlife information or circumstance that invalidates the existing analysis. Based on the most recent Idaho BLM Special Status Plants List (2014), no threatened, endangered, or other rare plant species occur at the project site.

The recently updated BLM-sensitive species list contains an additional fish species that is found in the Coeur d'Alene River watershed, the cedar sculpin, *Cottus schitsuumsh*. Though it was not on the sensitive species list at the time it was included in the original analysis. Environmental effects would be no different for the cedar sculpin now that it is on the sensitive species list therefore the previous analysis is adequate.

4. *Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?*

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the effects would be similar, both quantitatively and qualitatively to those analyzed in the EA.

5. *Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?*

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Public involvement associated with the EA adequately covered this proposed action, as there are only slight modifications to species of trees to be removed from the harvest area. No issues or concerns were raised to warrant additional public involvement.

F. Persons/Agencies Consulted

Jon Cantamessa & Vince Rinaldi: Past Shoshone County Commissioners
Current Shoshone County Commission
Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho
Idaho Department of Fish & Game
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Idaho Conservation League
Kootenai Environmental Alliance
The Ecology Center
The Lands Council
Idaho State Historic Preservation Office
Idaho Native Plant Society

G. Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/

7/29/15

Kurt Pavlat
Field Manager

Date